

Final Minutes
Trinity Adaptive Management Working Group
 Weaverville Victorian Inn, 1709 Main Street, Weaverville, CA
 September 13, 2005

The meeting was open to the public.

8:30 A.M. convene

Members in attendance:

Member:	Representative Seat:
Arnold Whitridge (Chairman)	Safe Alternatives for Forest Environment
Ed Duggan	Willow Creek Community Service District
David Steinhauser	Six Rivers Outfitter and Guide Association
Tom Weseloh	California Trout, Inc
Elizabeth Soderstrom	Natural Heritage Institute
James Feider	City of Redding Electric Utility Department
Richard Lorenz	Trinity County Resident
Serge Birk	Central Valley Project Water Association
Patrick Frost	Trinity County Resource Conservation District
James Spear	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Byron Leydecker	Friends of the Trinity River
Steve Anderson	Bureau of Land Management

Designated Federal Official: Mike Long Fish and Wildlife Service, Arcata, CA

1. Welcome and Introduction; Adopt Agenda; Approve Minutes of June meeting

Arnold Whitridge opened the meeting, the TAMWG members introduced themselves, and the members of the audience introduced themselves.

Mike Long, the Designated Federal Official, made introductory remarks. Long noted that the appointments of new TAMWG members were just finalized by the Department of the Interior. The new members were Tom Weseloh, California Trout (Byron Leydecker the former California Trout representative is now representing Friends of the Trinity River); Steve Anderson, Bureau of Land Management; Joan Hartmann, local landowner; and Spreck Rosekrans, Environmental Defense Fund.

The meeting was originally scheduled for two days. However, since two new members could not attend due to delays in their appointments, the meeting was now scheduled for one day. The agenda was modified so the items originally scheduled for the second day were addressed first. Items 3-5 and 12 were tabled to the next meeting when the new members would be present. Item 11 was moved to front of the agenda and item 6 to the end. (These minutes reflect the new order of the items, but the original item number is noted in the item title.)

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the changes the agenda.

Seconded Jim Feider.

Motion passed unanimously.

The scheduling of a special meeting to cover new member orientation and the deleted items of the original agenda was discussed. Possible dates were November 3 or 4. Whitridge would make the arrangements and notify the members.

Edits to the minutes. No changes were suggested for the June 2005 minutes.

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the minutes.

Jim Feider seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. Open Forum; Public Comment

There were no public comments.

3. Original item 11: Watershed sediment source control plans

MaryAnn Madej, U.S. Geological Survey, gave a brief slide presentation describing her investigation of sediment sources from tributaries to the mainstem. She talked about general processes that affect sediment delivery and some initial ideas and findings.

The main points of her presentation are summarized as follows. The sediment size classes of concern are those of diameters less than 8 mm and those of diameters greater than 153 mm. The idea being that those less than 8 mm represent sands and finer silts that bury spawning gravels; those greater than 153 mm represent cobbles and larger rocks that are too large for either fish or the river to move. Another focus of her investigation will be on sediment reduction strategies. Madej stated that tributaries are just as important as sources of sediment loading to the mainstem as the mainstem itself. She gave some stories from specific tributaries. Grass Valley was treated after problems occurred and treatments were focused on "in-channel" processes and was therefore expensive. In Rush Creek, sediment sources appear to be a combination of three known

sources: landslides, roads, and streambank erosion. Landslides are mainly confined to the wilderness areas and cannot be readily treated. Road sediments seem to come mainly from stream crossings and are treatable. Stream banks are another known source of sediment--some are treatable. However, the degree of sediment delivery from surface erosion from land use is not known.

During questioning, the TAMWG members asked questions about the need for Madej's analysis, the project strategies, and plans for cooperation with other sediment control programs in the basin. Richard Lorenz asked if these sorts of investigations haven't already been done. Madej acknowledged this but thought that more work was needed in "testing ideas." Jim Spear pointed out there has been 12-13 years of sediment work and treatment in Grass Valley and South Fork. Madej again acknowledged this. Serge Birk asked about Buckhorn pass area on highway 299 and about what techniques worked to stabilize the slope. Madej did not know, as she was not involved in that project. Elizabeth Soderstrom asked about erosion control approaches being used and their effectiveness. Madej cited culvert upgrades, mulches, streambank protection, and sediment basins as commonly used techniques. She emphasized that one has to look at site conditions and downstream conditions to determine techniques. Tom Weseloh asked about what sites are actually treatable. Madej said they are looking into this, but one issue is that they really don't know what is being done on Sierra Pacific private roads. She has talked to Sierra Pacific, but she has not been granted access to their land nor their roads data, and therefore really can't do much. Pat Frost pointed out this is not "prevention" but is actually "remediation." Frost noted that more time is needed with education of landowners in order to achieve true prevention. Byron Leydecker asked about her time commitment and her goals. Madej said she wanted to present some ideas and to use Rush Creek as an example. Rush Creek could produce ideas that would develop into a general strategy to use in other subbasins. Richard Lorenz asked about her cooperation with others such as Jim Spear and Pat Frost. Madej expressed a desire for cooperation and emphasized that she did not want to "reinvent the wheel." Jim Spear noted that such work would have stated benefits the mainstem but would also have benefits in the tributaries where the work is done. Tom Weseloh asked if an action plan would result from this work. Arnold Whitridge mentioned the sediment workshop being hosted by Andreas Kraus of the Trinity River Restoration Program this week.

4. Original Item 7: TRRP Budget

Doug Schleusner director of the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP) gave a slide presentation on the status of the budget and the new developments (Attachment 1 and Attachment 2). The Trinity Management Council (TMC) during their June meeting approved the TRRP budget but shifted \$285,000 from Indian Creek restoration to unspecified Technical Modeling and Analysis Group (TMAG) projects. The TMC recommended it be used in fisheries, and directed the TMAG to work with technical representatives of the TMC about the details of how it would be used. These details could not be resolved during a meeting and the matter was therefore sent back to the TMC.

There were questions and concerns expressed by the TAMWG about the logic of moving the funds out of Indian Creek. Two concerns were that the Indian Creek project would be

matched by up to \$775,000 of other (non-TRRP) funds and the money wasn't being moved to any specified project.

The rationale of the TMC budget adjustment was not clear even for those present that had attended the TMC meeting. One reason cited was an attempt to increase the level of effort of the TMAG program. Another reason was that the TMC didn't know about the matching funds. Schluesner suggested that TAMWG members speak to individual TMC members for more clarification. However, it seemed clear that no one wanted to justify the TMC budget adjustment.

Schluesner continued with his presentation. In this portion of his presentation, he described a significant addition to the TRRP budget. \$600,000 of Fish and Wildlife Service funds were unspent from fiscal year 2005 (FY2005) and are available for FY2006. This unspent money is the result of several events: money came late, some projects were not done, some projects were less expensive, and there are some position vacancies within the TRRP. In addition to this windfall, the Bureau of Reclamation also provided an additional \$690,000 of year-end, leftover funding that the TRRP was able to claim.

The updated funding levels for FY2006 are now about \$11.3 million compared to the previous estimate of \$10.6 million. These extra funds could be used to reinstate the \$285,000 Indian Creek project, avoid the deferred costs (i.e., the "construction bubble"), and supplement the TMAG.

The remaining portion of the budget presentation was by other TRRP staff of details of the TRRP budget. Ed Solbos, head of the Rehabilitation and Implementation Group (RIG) program, provided background on revisions to the RIG budgets. The RIG has an additional \$700,000 to be spent in FY2006. This will be spent on the Indian Creek sites, Poker Bar road, Hocker Flat construction, and coarse sediment introductions at the hatchery.

Joe Riess, RIG engineer, described work at Hocker Flat, the first of the restoration sites on the Trinity River. The project started in August and involves feathered edges, riparian berm removal, floodplain lowering, and tributary habitat enhancement. The excavation and heavy machinery work should be completed by December 20. He showed slides of the progress on one feathered edge site.

Ed Solbos continued with his presentation by showing plans for gravel enhancement into the river at the hatchery just below Lewiston Dam.

Rod Wittler, head of the Technical Modeling and Analysis Group (TMAG), described his program and how the revised budget is being handled. He listed some new activities such as advertising for new scientists, preparation of written documents, and changes to river monitoring. He noted a new task of habitat assessment, refinements to fish monitoring, and increased level of outside review of their activities.

During the question and answer session, Tom Weseloh pointed out a \$131,000 discrepancy to the budget. During the lunch break, Doug Schluesner straightened out the discrepancy and reported that this resulted in a \$131,000 increase in funds. These additional funds were then added to the budget as an increased \$17,500 for the USGS

temperature monitoring with the remainder going to the Canyon Creek project. (These adjustments are reflected in Attachment 1.)

Byron Leydecker commended this budget, stating that it was the most “forward-looking budget in the last 12 or 13 years.” Elizabeth Soderstrom asked about the budget shortfalls in the “out years.” Arnold Whitridge noted that the Record of Decision (ROD) did not recognize the real estate issues in the floodplain and there is an effort to fund this \$5 million shortfall.

Jim Spear asked Wittler to reiterate his comments about wildlife studies. Wittler asked the TAMWG to make a recommendation to the TRRP on the relative importance of wildlife in the program. The TAMWG agreed to agendaize a discussion at the next meeting.

Steve Anderson made a motion to accept the budget as proposed by the TRRP staff and that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC approve it, as recommended, starting at page 2 (Attachment 2).

Richard Lorenz seconded.

Motion passed unanimously. Tom Weseloh abstained.

During discussion of the above motion, Tom Weseloh expressed concern that the TMC moved the \$285,000 with apparent little regard to the ramifications. Arnold Whitridge pointed out that this is a “process issue” not a “budget issue” and this could be addressed in the next motion. Weseloh detailed out where the \$285,000 was going, and pointed out that rotary traps increased by \$110,000, with which he questioned.

Tom Weseloh made a motion to commend TRRP staff for gaining extra year-end funding, and thus providing program flexibility. In addition, he motioned that the TAMWG recommend that the TMC write to regional office of the Bureau of Reclamation thanking them for the year-end funds.

Elizabeth Soderstrom seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

Next, the discussion turned to the transfer by the TMC of the \$285,000 from the Indian Creek project to unspecified TMAG projects. After reviewing his notes, Mike Long judged that the TMC was not aware that the matching funds to the \$285,000 project were being placed at risk by the transfer.

Tom Stokely, Trinity County Planning, also noted that he thought the TMC did not understand the ramifications of the transfer. Stokely also noted that Trinity County had a problem with such transfers because the interests of Trinity County lie more with implementation, not science. He noted that the Trinity County representative at the TMC meeting voted against the transfer.

Ed Duggan suggested that the TAMWG draft a letter instead of a making a motion. Arnold Whitridge noted that a motion is needed for the chairman to sign a letter

Jim Feider made a motion that the chairman draft a letter to the TMC regarding the switching of the \$285,000 from the Indian Creek project to TMAG. With further discussion, the membership decided the letter should state that the movement of the \$285,000: 1) jeopardized matching funds from outside the program, 2) allocated money for an unknown purpose, 3) created a disincentive for those writing grants (e.g., Trinity County), and 4) was movement away from the desired allocation of 50:30:20 for implementation:science:overhead budget weighting. The letter would also state support for the TRRP staff putting money back into the Indian Creek project and would recommend that TMC advise Fish and Game of the return of funding to the Indian Creek project.

Seconded by Steve Anderson

Motion passed unanimously.

5. Original item 8: Fish health, run size, flow conditions, Klamath coordination

Rod Wittler, head of TMAG, gave a presentation of the Fall Pulse Flow (Attachment 3). He listed criteria that would trigger a fall pulsed flow. Primary criteria focus on assessments of expected conditions. Secondary criteria focus on real-time monitoring of temperature and fish. Nina Hemphill, TMAG fish biologist, presented background on the primary criteria (Attachment 4). Indications are that the run is going to be below average. Discharges at the Terwer gage on the lower Klamath River are 3,4000 cubic feet per second and are considered high for this time of year. Discharges at Iron Gate are regulated and are at normal levels (1150 cfs), so the extra flow seems to be coming from Salmon and other tributaries. In-river temperatures are lower. Fish migrate on a downward temperature trend and, thus, fish should be moving upriver. Tertiary criteria shows no disease yet, nor any pre-spawning mortality. In summary, Wittler noted that none of these criteria suggest a fall pulsed flow is needed.

Serge Birk asked about the status of the emergency water. It was reported that \$618,000 was spent on 20,000 acre-feet to be available for emergencies. However, the status of this water seemed to be unclear.

Mike Long also reported about blue-green alga levels found in Iron Gate and Copco Reservoirs. This relatively unknown alga (*Microcystis* sp.) can produce high levels of toxicity for humans. Monitoring is ongoing.

Elizabeth Soderstrom asked about the monitoring of the triggers and if anything should be done differently. Wittler noted that, in this year, the monitoring is occurring during a "null case" situation. This null case monitoring will help to modify triggers where needed. He noted that some triggers do not work and have been altered (e.g., disease vectors are not predictive as by the time it is detected, it is too late).

Serge Birk asked about the basis of the statement that chinook run size is “below average.” He pointed out that the predictions or estimates of run size do not necessarily equal density and that density is what is likely more important to fish mortality.

6. Original item 9: Science Framework

Rod Wittler, head of TMAG, described progress of preparation the Science Framework documents, the authors, and the schedule.

Wittler listed a variety of models being used. These include fluvial geomorphology models, temperature models, and fish production models (SALMOD). These models require data collection including fish, habitat, fluvial geomorphology and riparian monitoring.

7. Original item 10: Progress on Program Evaluation Report Recommendations

The TRRP program was evaluated by a subcommittee of the TMC in April 2004. Douglas Schleusner, director of the TRRP, gave an overview of his program’s responses to the evaluation. Schleusner organized the responses as those that the TRRP have largely achieved, those partially achieved, and those that still need more work (Attachment 5).

During the questions, the TAMWG members praised Schleusner for several areas in which good progress was made. There seemed to be consensus by TAMWG members that the TRRP should place more focus on development of the strategic plan. It was acknowledged that work stills needs to be done on Science Framework and the Science Advisory Board (SAB) needs more work. Arnold Whitridge opined that the SAB should provide guidance as a group (e.g., not through individual conversations). Jim Spear noted that the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, as described by Wittler, wasn’t really an RFP process because there was no competition. He noted that a non-competitive process might be less effective for the TRRP program. It was noted that the TMC needs to be more engaged. There was discussion about formalization of the technical subcommittees--better definition, advertisement of meetings, and the need for a core group. The mention of subcommittees brought up the recurring discussion about reimbursement of TAMWG representatives or alternates for expenses incurred while attending subcommittee meetings.

Schleusner next asked how well he had done in responding to the program evaluation report. Richard Lorenz thought he has done well, but asked that more emphasis on bottom recommendations. Tom Weseloh noted that, as a member of the TMC evaluation committee, he had already met with Schleusner and can meet again and discuss more. Arnold Whitridge emphasized the limited progress items—he is interested in the middle two. Elizabeth Soderstrom noted that NB9—strategic plan needs attention. She also noted that this is a great response to the evaluation and asked if it will this be done regularly. Schleusner thought that the evaluation would be reviewed every 12 months. There were thoughts that the strategic plan had stalled. There was discussion about a strategic plan and what it should do. It was thought it should fill in the gaps of the ROD and provide details for action plans.

It was agreed that Schleusner would make a list of subcommittees and how they will work.

Further suggestions were that, in an accomplishment report, Schleusner should try to link to goals and mission of the program and avoid listing tasks (e.g., hiring people). One of the major advances of the TRRP program is achieving the increased river flows.

8. Original item 6: Executive Director's report

Douglas Schleusner stated that he could make available the executive directors report after the meeting. However, most of the important issues have been addressed in the other items.

9. Original item 13: Open Forum; Public Comment

Arnold Whitridge asked about any other issues or public comment. There was no public comment.

Mike Long said he would send out some clarification on reimbursement in an email.

10. Original item 14: Assignments; date and agenda topics for next meeting

Arnold Whitridge asked for agenda topics for the next meeting. The new member's orientation and role of wildlife were mentioned. Possible dates for the November are 3rd and 4th; possible dates for the December meeting are the 7th through 9th.

11. Adjourn

List of motions that were passed:

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the changes the agenda.

Seconded Jim Feider.

Motion passed unanimously.

Ed Duggan made a motion to accept the minutes as amended.

Jim Feider seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

Steve Anderson made a motion to accept the budget as proposed by the TRRP staff and recommend that the TMC approve it as recommended starting at page 2.

Richard Lorenz seconded.

Motion passed unanimously. Tom Weseloh abstained.

Tom Weseloh made a motion to commend TRRP staff for gaining extra year-end funding, and providing program flexibility. Also, recommend that the TMC write to regional Bureau of Reclamation office and thanking them for the year-end funds.

Elizabeth Soderstrom seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

Jim Feider made a motion that the chairman draft a letter to the TMC regarding the switching of the \$285,000 from the Indian Creek project to TMAG. With further discussion, the membership decided the letter should state that the movement of the \$285,000: 1) jeopardized matching funds from outside the program, 2) allocated money for an unknown purpose, 3) created a disincentive for those writing grants (e.g., Trinity County), and 4) was movement away from the desired allocation of 50:30:20 for implementation:science:overhead budget weighting. The letter would also state support for the TRRP staff putting money back into the Indian Creek project and would recommend that TMC advise Fish and Game of the return of funding to the Indian Creek project.

Seconded by Steve Anderson

Motion passed unanimously.

List of Attachments:

Attachment 1: Trinity River Restoration Program slides used by TRRP staff.

Attachment 2: FY2006 Budget and estimated out-year projections.

Attachment 3: Fall Flow Update.

Attachment 4: Trinity/Klamath Coordination Meeting.

Attachment 5: Trinity River Restoration Program Memorandum: Status of April 2004 Program Evaluation Report Recommendations.